

REMARKS

In the drawings, Figure 5 is amended to conform the depicted flow chart blocks with their description in the specification. Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-21 have been amended. Claims 1-21 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 101 Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because these claims are not limited to tangible embodiments. Pursuant to the Examiner's suggestion, Applicants have amended claims 15-21 to replace "computer-accessible medium" with "computer-accessible storage medium" and submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection has been overcome.

Section 102(b) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8-10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Madany et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0032235) (hereinafter, "Madany"). Although Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to expedite issuance of a patent, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify their distinctive features.

Madany fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicants' amended claim 1. Specifically, Madany fails to teach or suggest a system including a server configured to execute an application; a stateless client configured to communicate with the server, and further configured such that during use, a user interacts with the application via the stateless client; and a mass storage device locally coupled to the stateless client, wherein the mass storage device is accessible by the user via the server; where the server is further configured to store data to the mass storage device via the stateless client in response to the user's interaction with the application.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner refers to the flash 405 and smartcard interface 408 features of Madany's human interface device (HID) as shown in FIG. 4. However, neither of these devices is a mass storage device accessible by a user via a server, where the server is further configured to store data to the mass storage device via the stateless client in response to the user's interaction with an application executing on the server. Madany does disclose that the HID client is a stateless device and that user state is maintained on the server, not the client (para. 31). However, Madany does not disclose the purpose of flash 405. Given that the HID is stateless and absent further disclosure, Madany neither teaches nor suggests that flash 405 is in any way user-accessible, whether via a server in response to user interaction with an application executing on the server or otherwise. The stateless nature of the HID in fact suggests that, to the contrary, flash 405 is not user-accessible.

Similarly, smartcard interface 408 does not disclose an instance of the recited mass storage device. While Madany discloses that user credentials may be retrieved from a smart card for user session authentication (e.g., para. 31), there is no discussion in Madany supporting any type of storage of data to the smart card by the server in any fashion, much less by a server via the stateless client in response to a user's interaction with an application executing on the server as specifically recited. Madany's smart card is an authentication device, not a mass storage device for user-accessible application data storage.

As Madany fails to teach or suggest the limitation of claim 1, Madany cannot be said to anticipate claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is distinguishable over Madany, as is independent claim 8, which has been amended to recite limitations similar to claim 1.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madany in view of Soderstrom et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0047454)

(hereinafter, “Soderstrom”), claims 6 and 13 as being unpatentable over Madany in view of Pooni et al. (U.S. Publication 2004/0064461) (hereinafter, “Pooni”), claims 7 and 14 as being unpatentable over Madany in view of Hochmuth et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0056063) (hereinafter, “Hochmuth”), claims 15-17 and 19 as being unpatentable over Madany in view of Doyle et al. (U.S. Patent 6,438,550) (hereinafter, “Doyle”), claim 18 as being unpatentable over Madany in view of Doyle and further in view of Soderstrom, claim 20 as being unpatentable over Madany in view of Doyle and further in view of Pooni, and claim 21 as being unpatentable over Madany in view of Doyle and further in view of Hochmuth. Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Madany in view of Doyle fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 15. Specifically, the cited references fail to teach or suggest, either individually or in combination, a computer-accessible storage medium comprising program instructions, where the program instructions are computer-executable by a server to: detect the presence of a mass storage device locally coupled to a stateless client; and interface the mass storage device to an application executable on the server; wherein a user interacts with the application via the stateless client, wherein the mass storage device is accessible by the user via the server, and wherein the program instructions are further executable to store data to the mass storage device via the stateless client in response to the user’s interaction with the application.

As argued above with respect to claim 1, Madany does not teach or suggest any aspect of a mass storage device locally coupled to a stateless client such that the mass storage device is accessible by a user via a server, and where the server stores data to the mass storage device via the stateless client in response to the user’s interaction with an application executable on the server. Therefore, Madany fails to disclose or suggest similar limitations regarding the operation of the mass storage device, server, stateless client and application recited in claim 15. Applicants additionally note that as a stateless client, Madany’s HID cannot execute applications and is not a server. Thus, Madany cannot teach or suggest a computer-accessible medium comprising instructions that are

computer-executable by a server to perform specific functions in relation to a stateless client, as recited in claim 15.

Doyle fails to teach or suggest those limitations of claim 15, as well as claims 1 and 8, that are absent from Madany. Specifically, Doyle does not disclose in any fashion that the smart card 502 used to access the system is in any way capable of storing data from the system, much less storing data from a server via a stateless client in response to a user's interaction via the stateless client with an application executing on the server. As noted below, Doyle does not disclose any aspect of stateless clients or their operation.

Notwithstanding the failure of Doyle in combination with Madany to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 15, Applicants submit that the proposed combination of Doyle with Madany would fundamentally change the operating principle of Madany. As such, the combination is insufficient to render the pending claims *prima facie* obvious. MPEP 2143.01.VI, citing *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959). Specifically, as noted above, the system of Madany is fundamentally predicated on a stateless client architecture in which “state and computation functions have been removed from the HID [the stateless client] and reside on data sources or services [provided by servers]” (para. 38). Thus, the stateless client of Madany does not implement or execute user applications, but instead relies on servers to provide this functionality.

By contrast, Doyle discloses a system in which both clients and servers are “stateful,” e.g., implement state resources and are capable of executing applications (e.g., Figs. 3, 5 and col. 4, line 43 – col. 5, line 17). Specifically, Doyle describes that the system client 300 shown in Fig. 3 runs an operating system, and that the variant of the client 500 shown in Fig. 3 executes applications. Doyle further provides that with specific reference to smart card operations, an application executing on the client interacts with the user of the client to retrieve data from the smart card (col. 6, lines 38-47). However, this operation of Doyle is fundamentally irreconcilable with that of Madany, since the client of Madany is inherently incapable of executing such applications owing to its stateless nature. As a result, any combination of Doyle with

Madany would result in “a change in the basic principle under which [Madany] was designed to operate,” thus rendering the combination impermissible. MPEP 2143.01.VI, citing *In re Ratti* at 813.

Applicants note that the remaining cited references fail to teach or suggest those limitations argued above to be absent from Madany and Doyle. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that each of the independent claims is distinguishable over the cited references, as are each of the dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicants hereby petition for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-76100/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☐ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☐ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☒ Replacement Drawing Sheet for Fig. 5

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: January 18, 2007